II. REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering these amendments, Claims 16-22 remain pending.

A. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 16 – 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to more specifically point out and distinctly claim that which the applicants regard as the invention. In view of these amendments, it is believed that these rejections are no longer warranted and should be withdrawn. More specifically, claims 16, 19 and 21 have been amended as set out below.

Claim 16 was rejected as being indefinite on the basis of what was intended by the phrase "a stack of individual flat laminations arranged parallel to the centerline, *wherein two of the laminations bound [sic] the stack.*" The italicized portion of the quote means that two of the laminations form the opposing sides or "boundaries" (hence the use of the word "bound")of the stack. Claim 16 has been amended to clarify this meaning and recites "the stack being bounded on two opposing sides by a lamination having a flat outer face, the flat outer faces defining opposing sides of the core".

Claim 16 was further rejected as being indefinite as to what was intended by the phrase "each lamination comprises *opposite* longitudinal edges that are non-parallel to the centerline to form *the core with a substantially frustoconical profile.*" It is believed that use of the word "substantially" to modify the word "frustroconical" was improper since both words imply generality. Further it is believe the word "profile" added to the confusion on the part of the examiner, since the shape actually being referred to is a three dimensional shape, and not a two dimensional shape. Claim 16 has therefore been additionally

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

PAGE 6/9 * RCVD AT 6/13/2005 2:50:51 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/5 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:17349946331 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28

amended to replace "substantially frustroconical profile" with – a frustroconical shape between the flat outer faces of the two laminations bounding the stack –.

Claim 19 was rejected as being indefinite as to what was intended by the phrase "a stack of individual flat laminations arranged parallel to the centerline, *wherein two of the laminations bound the stack.*" Claim 19 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 16 and now recites "a stack of individual flat laminations arranged parallel to the centerline; *the stack being bounded on two opposing sides by a lamination having a flat outer face, the flat outer faces defining opposing sides of the core.*"

Claim 19 was also rejected as being indefinite as to what was intended by the phrase "each lamination comprises opposite longitudinal edges that form the core with a *defined longitudinal profile and that are separated by flat outer faces of the two laminations bounding the stack.*" Claim 19 has been further amended in a manner similar to claim 16 and now recites "each lamination of the stack having opposing longitudinal edges that form the core with circumferential zones that are separated by the flat outer faces of the two laminations bounding the stack."

Claim 21 was rejected as being indefinite in terms of "the structure/arrangement of the tab(s) structure of the 'opposite longitudinal edges of the laminations' relative to the tab(s) of the 'two laminations bounding the stack.'" As amended, Claim 21 now recites that "a plurality of the laminations include tabs that contact the tabs of the two laminations bounding the stack." The plurality of laminations is not the same as the two laminations bounding the stack.

Prior to discussing the reference, it is believed that a brief discussion on the current form of the independent claims of this application is warranted. Specifically, Claim 16 now recites each lamination of the stack has opposing longitudinal edges, that the opposing longitudinal edges are tapered inwardly substantially along their length toward

PAGE 7/9 * RCVD AT 6/13/2005 2:50:51 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/5 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:17349946331 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28

the centerline; and that the longitudinal edges of adjacent ones of the laminations varying in height from the centerline, thereby cooperating to form the core with a frustoconical shape between the flat outer faces of the two laminations that define the boundaries of the stack. Further, Claim 19, in its amended form, now recites that each lamination of the stack has opposing longitudinal edges that define circumferential zones between the flat outer faces of the two laminations that form the boundaries of the stack.

B. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,703,556, to Kikuta et al ("Kikuta"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner has stated that Kikuta discloses a core structure for an ignition coil comprising a stack of individual flat laminations arranged parallel to a centerline, each lamination comprises opposite longitudinal edges that are non-parallel to the center line to form the core with a substantially frustoconical profile/longitudinal profile However, Applicants submit that upon a detailed review of Kikuta, it is seen that the reference does not disclose a core element with a frustoconical shape.

As shown in the side view of Figure 3, and as described in column 3, lines 39-43 of Kikuta, the plates are stacked one on the other, each of which is a flat plate with its opposite end portions having a width greater than that of its middle portion, the latter of which is shown as having a constant dimension. As seen by the cross section of Fig. 6, the middle portion of Kikuta's stack is generally round Since the middle portion of each lamination is of constant dimension, the middle portion of Kikuta's stack is cylindrical along its length, not frustroconical as claimed.

PAGE 8/9 * RCVD AT 6/13/2005 2:50:51 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/5 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:17349946331 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28

When viewing the end portions of Kikuta in the side view of Fig. 3, it is noted that only the outermost lamination is visible. This means that the laminations further toward the interior of the stack do not have a height from the centerline of the core greater than the outermost lamination. Knowing this, the structure of the end portions of Kikuta can only be described, at best, as a flat wedge and this is further support by the end view of 5, which shows a rectangular shape. Thus, the end portions of Kikuta are also not frustroconical as claimed.

From the above, it is seen that no portion of the Kikuta's core is provided with a frustoconical shape as recited in the claims of the present application. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

C. CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Eric J. Sosenko
Reg. No.: 34,440
Attorney for Applicant(s)

(734) 302-6000

BRINKS HOFER GILSON &LIONE

PAGE 9/9 * RCVD AT 6/13/2005 2:50:51 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/5 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:17349946331 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28